THE KARNATAKA SALES TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981. *

Leave to Introduce

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have received the recommendation of the Governor for the Introduction of the Karnataka Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1981 in pursuance of Clause (1) of Article 207 of the Constitution of India.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY (Minister for Finance and Tourism).—Sir, I beg to move –

"That leave be granted to introduce the Karnataka Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1981."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is –

"That leave be granted to introduce the Karnataka Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1981."

The Motion was adopted and leave was granted.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.—Sir, I introduce the Karnataka Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1981.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Bill is introduced.

THE KARNATAKA APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL, 1981.

Motion to Consider

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY (Minister for Finance & Tourism).—Sir, I beg to move.

"That the Karnataka Appropriation (Vote on Account)Bill, 1981. "be taken into consideration".

The question was proposed

SRI D. DEVRAJ URS —Sir, yesterday while replying to the Budget debate, the hon. Minister for Finance made a mention and assertively said that there is 17% more expenditure on developmental activities for year 1980-81. I would like only to draw the attention of the Minister to the last but one page of the Budget Speech of his, the Revenue account and Expenditure, I must mention here that the hon. Minister's Statement or assertion that th re is an increase of 17% expenditure on developmental activities in the year 1980-81 is far from truth.

(SRI S. S. ARAKERI.—In the Chair)

---

* ANNEXURE—V

Sir, I again particularly stress on this development expenditure. Generally, on the whole there is an increase of 17% ಕಾಯಿದೆಯೊಳಗೆ ತಿರುಳು ಇದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿಕೊಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ೧೭ ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಓವರ್‌ಆಲ್ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನೇ ನೀವು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು. ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟಲ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡಿಚರ್ ಎಲ್ಲಿದೇ ? ತಾವು ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟಲ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡಿಚರ್ ಅನ್ನು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದು ಗೊತ್ತೇ ಇದೆ. ನೀವೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.—The per capita development outlay is 17% as against of 1979-80.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್.—ಇನ್ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಇದ್ದರೆ ತೋರಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಿ. ನೀವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹೀಗಿದೆ. ಕ್ಯಾಪಿಟಲ್ ಅಕೌಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ೨೫೧ ರಿಂದ ೩೧೮ನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಕ್ಯಾಪ್ಟಿಲ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ಯಾವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ? ಇದು ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಟೋಟಲ್ ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ೩೯೦ ರಿಂದ ೩೬೨ ಕೋಟಿಗೆ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. Planning is completely a developmental activity and the developmental activities are more or less put in the planning ಜೋದವರ್ಷ ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಟಾರ್ಗೆಟ್ ರೀಚ್ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇವರು ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡಿಚರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಟಿ ಸರ್ವೀಸ್ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. Budget at a glance ಇದೆಯಲ್ಲ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡಿಚರ್ ಏಟಂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಸರ್ವೀಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ೩.೫ ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಇನ್‌ಕ್ರೀಸ್ ಆಗಿದೆ. ನಾನು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಹೆಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ೩೦೪.೦೯೨ ಕೋಟಿಯಿಂದ ರಿವೈಸ್ಡ್ ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ೩೧೬.೪೭ ಕೋಟಿ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಆಷ್ಟು ಪೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಏರ್ಪಡ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದು ೩.೫ ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಇನ್‌ಕ್ರೀಸ್ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಎಕನಾಮಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವೀಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಬಜೆಟ್ ಹೆಡ್ ೩೧೪.೮೪ ಕೋಟಿ ಇದ್ದದ್ದನ್ನು ೩೦೯.೩೪ ಕೋಟಿಗೆ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಮೈನಸ್ ೨ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ (೨) ಆಯಿತು. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಜನರಲ್ ಸರ್ವೀಸಸ್‌ಗೆ ಬಂದರೆ, ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ ೨೪೦ ೪೨ ಕೋಟಿ ಬಜೆಟ್ ಅಮೌಂಟ್ ಇದ್ದದು ೨೬೩.೪೧ ಕೋಟಿಗೆ ಏರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. There is a clean 11% increase here. ನಾನು ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಜನರಲ್ ಸರ್ವೀಸಸ್ ಎಂಬುದು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯೇ ? ೧೧% + ೩ ಚಿಲ್ಲರೆ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ೨ ಚಿಲ್ಲರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಒಟ್ಟು ೧೭ ಬರಹುದು. ಇದನ್ನೇ ತಾವು ಬೇಳಿದ್ದು. ಈ ೧೭ರಲ್ಲಿ ೨ ತೆಗೆದುಬಿಡಿ. ೧೫ ಉಳಿಯಿತು. ಈ ೧೫ ರಲ್ಲಿ ೧೧ ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಇದೇನು ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ? ಸಂಬಳ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಿಜ. ೪೦ ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಯಷ್ಟು ಡಿ. ಎ. ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, our Finance Minister wants us to believe that giving more D. A. is also a development. ೧೭ ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಎಂದು ಪೇಪರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಜೋರಾಗಿ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು, but one thing I must admire him that he is capable. ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ಕನ್ನಡದಿಂದ ಬಂದವರು. ಇವರಿಗೆ ಬಣ್ಣ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು, ಕಥಕ್ಕಳಿ ಡ್ಯಾನ್ಸ್ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯುವಷ್ಟು ನಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಾಸ್ಮೆಟಿಕ್ಸ್ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಕುಣಿಯುವುದು ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಿಳಿದಿರುವ ಅವರು ಕಾಸ್ಮೆಟಿಕ್ಸ್ ಬಳಿದು ಪಾಸನೆ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಸುಗಂಧ ತರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ. For that I did compliment him and even now I compliment him. ಬಳಿಗೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕಾಸ್ಮೆಟಿಕ್ಸ್ ತೆಗೆದು ನೋಡಿ ಹೇಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು. You were clever enough to avoid it. I want you to show it now. Your development expenditure namely 11% is only on general services. If you call it a development, alright, you call it. But let not we and the people befooled by this kind of version. We know that this is no more a dovelopment. ಇನ್ನೊಂದಿಪ್ಪತ್ತು ಜನ ಆಫೀಸರ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅದು ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. That is only called a developmental expenditure, That is all I point out.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR (Chickpet).—Sir. I heard Sri M. Veerappa Moily yesterday during his long reply. But I should raise one point in the first instance. In my speech I had referred to this resorting to Vote on Account. This is an important point. If the Minister thinks that it is not important. I have no reply. Resorting to Vote on Account under Article 206 is an unusual one, it should not be resorted to in a normal year, where there is no difficulty, no trouble, no election. But if there is an immediate assumption of office by a party after an election and if the party does not have time. I under stand that the Vote on Account can be resorted to. But here the present Government had 15 months at their disposal. Why this attempt of seeking Vote on Account is done ? I made this point last year also. Seeking Vote on Account will have deleterious effect on the administration. There may not be a sense of security in the minds of people who are engaged in developmental activities and the funds may not be forthcoming in a regular manner and it would create so many other difficulties also. Therefore it will not be in the interest of the state that the Government should resort to this attempt of seeking Vote on Account. The Finance Minister in his reply has not made this point clear. Like an ordinance making power exercised by the Governor, the Vote on Account should be resorted to only under extraordinary siuation when either of the two Houses are not sitting and immediate action is necessary about important matters, the ordinance making power is resorted to by the Governor on the advice of the Council of Ministers. I would very much like to be enlightened by the Finance Minister about this point.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ ಮೊಯ್ಲಿ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈಗ ಪಾಸ್ಸ.....

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—So far as 1981-82 budget estimate is concerned, from the last year's revised estimates to this years budget estimates under the following four colums there is an increase of 5%.

1. Social and Community Services ;
2. Economic Services ;
3. General Services ;
4. Grant-in-aid and contributions ;

ಈ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಐಟಂನಿಂದ ಸೆ ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಇನ್‌ಕ್ರೀಸ್ ಇದೆ. ಜನರಲ್ ಸರ್ವೀಸಸ್ ಅಫೈರ್ ರೀಟೈನ್ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್-ಇನ್-ಏಡ್ ಸ್ಕಾಲರ್‌ಷಿಪ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಸದು ಸಾರಿಗಿಂತ ಮೂರು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಕಮ್ಯುನಿಟಿ ಸರ್ವೀಸಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಿಜ. ೩೧೬ಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ೩೫೩ ಕೋಟಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. In Social and Community Services, I agree that you have increased from 316 Crores to 353 crores. But when you said that you have spent 17% more, that is misleading and it is incorrect,

೧೨-೩೦ ಪಿ.ಎಂ.

ಶ್ರೀ. ಜಯದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್.— ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸು ಸಚಿವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ತರಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸಾಮೂಹಿಕ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ೧೯೭೯ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಯಾವ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿತ್ತು ಅದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹಿಂದೆ ಸರಿದು, ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿ ಮತ್ತು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ, ಶೇಕಡ ೧೭ರಷ್ಟು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ? ಸಂಬಳಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಹಣವನ್ನೂ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗಾದ ವೆಚ್ಚವೆಂದು ತಾವು ಕರೆಯುವುದಾದರೆ, ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ, ಹಿಂದಿನ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿದ್ದ ನೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹಿಂದೆ ಸರಿದಿದೆ ; ಇದನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.—I am not misleading you by giving this statistics. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the compliments because we had the privilege of working under him. The hon. Leader of Opposition may kindly refer to Page 9, Table 2.5 of the Economic Survey. It is there as 'Investment Effort.' You may say that we should not have taken that figure, we should take some other figure etc. That is a different matter. But what I have reffered to is the figure of the development efforts wherein in 1979-80 the revised estimates is Rs. 789 crores and in 1980-81 it is 925.17 crores. If we take this into account, it is 17%. Of course you may say "You should not have referred to this and that." But this is the development effort made by the Government. It is State Plan outlay, outlay on Centrally Sponsored and Central Plan Schemes, Non-plan Development Expenditure on Revenue Account, Non-plan Capital Outlay, Western Ghats Development and Private Sector Investment. This is 17% is derived from that. You can say that these premises are not good. This is a degree of argument.

SRI D DEVARAJ URS.—I have never said that.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.—I will come to your point. So 17% development effort is this. This we have taken credit to. This is one thing. Next point is development expenditure on the Social and Community Services. I would like the hon. Leader of the Opposition to read page 39 of the Economic Survey because there are different indices. We cannot concentrate on one. Under this Social and Community Services for 1980-81 it is Rs. 304.92 and for 1981-82 it is Rs. 353.5 Economic services is 314.84. According to that, the increase is 16%. But my calculation of 17% is related to the other development efforts.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—There are two aspects. Now the hon. Minister seems to rely on the Economic Survey of 1980-81. On page 39 Table 5.3 shows that there is an increase of 17%. It is that he

says, according to the development and non-development expenditure.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.— 17% is derived from page 9 Table 2 5 of the Economic Survey and not from other page.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, one factor the hon. Minister should bear in mind. Here the private sector investment is also included. Kindly go through.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.—I have said that.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—You have stated. His whole exercise has been to show to this House that last year's effort is something worthy of taking note of. Alright. As a finance Minister, he has to claim credit for the work they have done. But when he says that from the last year to this year *i.e.*, from 1979-80 to 1980-81, they should hold themselves responsible for the three months *i.e.*, January, February and March. In all these three months, their expenditure tempo has come down. I have stated it and again I am repeatedly stating. That is why your plan expenditure was totally reduced by more than 30 crores. That is my point. Rs. 190 and odd crores has come down to Rs. 160 crores, in these three moths. They did not spend money. The plan expenditure to that extent is curtailed, overal capital investment including the private sector. Then I would like to take from 1972 onwards. Come on, let us see by how many percentage this kind of tempo had increased every year, whether your 17% is exceeded by some other previous years or not. Let me know. You want only to compare from 1979-80 to 1980-81 and say that you have done better by increasing the capital expenditure including the private sector investment to 17%? No. It cannot be. According to this, the whole thing is taken including the private sector.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.—That has been assumed since long. After all it is not a new phenomenon as far as this year is concerned. Even in 1978-79 we have assumed that, This has not been assumed all of a sudden. It is an economic indicator accepted by all.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Let him give comparative table. I did not say that this has been introduced for the first time. I merely stated that he is relying on this total including public sector. Supposing some Birlas open three cement factories, suddenly the whole thing will go up. What has the Government done? He may say because Government gave land, because Government gave water, helped him to get a licence, Government gave lime-stone, so he invested and hence there is so much of investment. I am asking your Governmental expenditure on developmental activities. That is the true reflection of what you will keep or not.

You have not been able to spend that much of amount having given yes, it has to be given, I have never said about it or against it. You had given it You want to give this D.A and that has been the practice. Whenever the Central Government increases its DA to the Central Staff, we have been giving. You have given, well and good. Nearly to the tune of Rs. 40 crores you have given, that is why under one item of general expenditure, you have gone by 11%. Why did you include it under this? Now I am happy, at least let us come to this understanding. You have relied on this table. I have relied on the table of yourbudget. There I am wrong here you are wrong. There you are right, here I am right.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY .— I will throw some more light.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS .— No, again and again he wants to give comparison. I would like to go back to previous years.

(INTERRUPTION)

SRI B. V. KAKKILAYA .— In 1979—80, the rate of inflation that is the value of rupee was 24 paise and to-day it is only 18 paise. So 6 paise is reduced this year. What you have claimed to have increased in the developmental activity, the money you have allotted has to be reduced by that 6 paise per rupee.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY .— It is quite interesting. Of course the Leader of the Opposition gave me a compliment that we are expert in Yakshagana. Personally I know Yakshagana dances. I have also learnt it. Now I would like to demonstrate it.

(Laughter)

I am coming back to the net development of the performance short fall. In 1978—79, the plan outlay was Rs. 323.56 crores. Actually spent Rs. 275.54 crores. That means expenditure was only Rs. 85.16. Shortfall in that year is minus 14.84. It goes against you not against you, against all of us because we were part of the Government. I am not trying to accuse. It has happened. It is a factual thing. In 1979—80 again and even in 1978—79, there was a highest shortfall that is minus 14.84. There was a shortfall from the budget outlay. It came down. Again in 1979—80, actual plan outlay of that year is 360.39 but actually what was spent, that means after a cut is Rs.327.67. Percentage of expenditure of plan outlay is 90.92. That means there was a shortfall minus 9.08. Coming to 1980—81, the plan outly was 92.55, actual expenditure after a cut which we have frankly admitted, that is why I have said yesterday that as a straightforward gentleman I went to the Planning Commission and got a cut. Because it should be the actual.

That tradition I would like to conitnne next year also. There is no point in just taking and not spending it. That is not proper. That is why I said we must be very frank on this finance. There is nothing to hide or do anything Since 1980, what has happened is Mr Speaker, the plan outlay was 39.55 actually amont sought was Rs. 367.30. That means plan expenditure is 93.56: That means. short fall is minus 6.44 That means to say, that the short fall all these 3 years was the lowest. This is the clear picture, Any way different indices are there. One can draw his own figure and work out percentage. That is a diffierent matter. Mr. Kakkilaya was not present yesterday. Otherwise he would not have raised that question. About price I did say that the whole-sale price index for agricultural commodities in 1978-79, was 4.33, in 1979-80, it was 511, in 1980-81 it was 570, that means in 1979-80 over 1978-79 plus 80 is 18.0. 1980-81 over 1979-80 plus11.5. So it is reduced. The money value has not comparatively come down,

(INTERRUPTION)

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS .— He must know the latest figure. Your wholesale price index has gone up.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY .— It has gone up but the percentage in that year...

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS .— It is not your percentage that is calculated. Your percentage is calculated before the close of this year.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY .— I will collect it again.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.- It has already come in the papers.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY .— I rely on the economic survey...

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS .— Till the month of February of this year, if you take, there is a steady increase. You have taken a period when there was a lull in the increase for some time. These figures only you depend and we also depend on this only. We do not have diffierent figures here.

SRI B. V. KAKKILAYA .— My point was that the price indices in Karnataka is about 6% more than the all India figure. Is it true or not?

A. MEMBER.— They have said that.

SRI B. V. KAKKILAYA .— When they have said that why do they challenge that.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS .— When he quoted that there was a shortfall in 1978-79 in the developmental activities or the expenditure, what was the budgetary position? What was the minus side? With what minus budget did we start and how do we end? These are all factors which we have to look into.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY .—I am telling that the overall objective should be taken as to how the plan cut was effected from year to year I am not just accusing. I have not quoted these figures just to accuse anybody. But I am telling, as far as shortfall is comcerned when compared to all these 3 years. this is the lowest. For this minimum and limited point, I have submitted.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS .— It is for you to depend on the 17% developmental activities or expenditure and say that we have done well. I say that you are not standing on a firm ground. This is all my point.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY .— I do not think it is the correct position because 17% developmental efforts which any Government should be boast of. I need not be diffident about it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER .— The question is:

"That the Karnataka Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1981 be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted

Clause by Clause Consideration

CLAUSES 2, 3 and SCHEDULE

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER .— The question is:

"That Clause 2, 3 and Schedule, do stand part of the Bill."

The Motion was adopted

Clauses 2, 3 and schedule were added to the Bill

CLAUSE 1, ETC.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.— The question is:

"That Clause 1, Title and Preamble do stand part of the bill."

The Motion was adopted

Clause 1, the Long Title, the Preamble and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Motion to Pass

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY (Minister for Finance:).— I beg to move "That the Karnataka Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1981 be passed,"

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER .— The question is :

"That the Karnataka Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill" be passed."

The Motion was adopted and the Bill was passed.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION

Reg : Karnataka State Universities (Amendment) Ordinance, 1981.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, I beg to move :

"That this Assembly disapproves Ordinance No. 5 of 1981. "The Karnataka State Universities (Amendment) Ordinance, 1981" issued by the Governor or Karnataka on 22nd February, 1981".

The question was proposed.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್.—ನಾವು ತರಾವನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಕಾರಣ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ೨೨-೨-೧೯೮೧ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಇದು ಬಂದು ಒಂದು ತಿಂಗಳು ಕೆಲವು ದಿವಸಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಕವರ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಲ್ ತಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಬಿಲ್ ತರದೆ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಕಾರಣ ? ಇದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಏನಿತ್ತು ? ಮೊದಲು ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಒಂದೇ ಮೆಮೋರಾಂಡಮ್ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. "Karnataka Act 28 of 1976. After sub-section 9 the following sub-section shall be deemed to have been inserted with effect from 1st January, 1979." ಒಟ್ಟು ಇದ್ದ ೯ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ೧೦ನೆಯದು ಒಂದು ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಬಂದಿರುವುದು ೨೨-೨-೧೯೮೧ರಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಹೇಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಮೆಸೂದೆಯು ಎಫೆಕ್ಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ೧೯೭೯ನೇ ಜನವರಿಯಿಂದ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ಪರ್‌ಪಸ್ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇದೆ. ಕಾಲ ಆಗಿದೆ ಆದರೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಜೀವಂತಗೊಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಇರುವುದು ೩೧ನೇ ಮಾರ್ಚಿ ವರೆಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಏನು ವಿಚಿತ್ರ "ಬ್ರೈನ್ ವರ್ಕ್". ಇದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶಂಕರರಾವ್ ಅವರ ಬ್ರೈನೋ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆಯವರದೋ ಏನು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಇಷ್ಟು ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಮಂತಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಯಾವ ದಾದರೂ ನೆಪ ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರು ಪ್ರವೀಣರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಂದೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಆಗಲಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ, ಈಗ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಿಕ್ಕಿತೋ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಪುಣ್ಯ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಗಾದೆ ಇದೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೊದಲು ಇದ್ದ ೫೫ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಏನು ಇತ್ತು, ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ೭೬ರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಫಿಲೀಯೇಷನ್ ಆಫ್ ಕಾಲೇಜುಸ್.

"Section 53 : Colleges within the University area may on satisfying the conditions specified in this section be affiliated to the University as affiliated college by the State Government."

ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತದೆ

"A college applying for affiliation to the University shall send an application to the Registrar of the University within the time fixed by ordinance and shall satisfy the Syndicate and the Academic Council".